

Appln No. 09/471,208
Amdt date October 5, 2004
Reply to Office action of July 8, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-27 will be pending in this application upon entry of the above amendments. Claims 22-27 have been added. The new claims find support in the original specification, claims, and drawings. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and remarks that follow, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, reexamination, and an early indication of allowance of claims 1-27.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 7, and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kalra in view of Zamiska and Progressive Networks (RealVideo® Content Creation Guide v1.0, 1995). The Examiner also rejects claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kalra. The Examiner further rejects claims 5-6, 8, 13, and 17-21 as being unpatentable over a combination of one or more of Kara, Zamiska, Progressive Networks, Brunson (U.S. Patent No. 5,760,823), and Roach (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,172). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

"In a computer network, . . . a method for packaging a single 3D animated content data . . . comprising:

.
. .
.

identifying first and second streaming data . . . ,
the first and second streaming data being respectively
associated with first and second scenes of the single
3D animated content;

.
. .
.

Appln No. 09/471,208

Amdt date October 5, 2004

Reply to Office action of July 8, 2004

identifying a first duration of a first scene and
a second duration of a second scene;

storing the streaming data for the first and
second scenes in first and second streams files
associated with the scenes, each stream file being of
a size calculated from the identified data rate and
the duration of the respective scene; and

streaming each stream file . . . during playback
of the respective scene, the stream file calculated to
finish downloading by the remote user computer prior
to the end of the playback of the respective scene."
(Emphasis added).

Neither Kalra, Zamiska, nor Progressive Networks teaches or suggests the limitations of claim 1. None of the cited references teaches or suggests "first and second streaming data . . . respectively associated with first and second scenes of the 3D animated content." Although multiple stream files may exist in the systems disclosed in the cited references, the stream files are not dedicated to different scenes of a single 3D animated content. Accordingly, none of the cited references teach or suggest "storing the streaming data for the first and second scenes in first and second stream files . . . each stream file being of a size calculated from the identified data rate and the duration of the respective scene" nor "streaming each stream file . . . during playback of the respective scene, the stream file calculated to finish downloading by the remote user computer prior to the end of the playback of the respective scene" as is recited in claim 1.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner contends that Zamiska discloses identifying the duration of a scene. In doing so, the Examiner relies on the portion of Zamiska that discloses the

Appln No. 09/471,208
Amdt date October 5, 2004
Reply to Office action of July 8, 2004

identification of a duration of a stream, and contends that "the duration of a stream comprising a digital source information file corresponds to the duration of the source information (scene) from which it was captured." (Office action, p. 5, par. 1). There is nothing to teach or suggest, however, that the streams in Zamiska are associated with different scenes of a single 3D animated content. Rather, the streams in Zamiska are associated with different types of information contained in a source information. For example, the streams in Zamiska may be motion capture information streams, close captioning data streams, still picture streams, and 3D animation streams contained in the source information. (See, Col. 6, lines 18-21). Accordingly, claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 9 and 14 include limitations that are similar to the limitations of claim 1 which make claim 1 allowable. Accordingly, claims 9 and 14 are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-8, 10-13, and 15-21 are also in condition for allowance because they depend on an allowable base claim, and for the additional limitations that they contain.

Claims 22-27 are new in this application. These claims are also in condition for allowance because none of the references teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in these claims.

Appln No. 09/471,208

Amdt date October 5, 2004


Reply to Office action of July 8, 2004

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration, reexamination, and allowance of the now pending claims 1-27 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By


Josephine E. Chang

Reg. No. 46,083

626/795-9900

JEC/dlf

LAL PAS576752.1--10/5/04 8:48 AM